



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JIGJR: 06-04

Paper No: 24

ERWIN SCHWARTZ
305 BAFFIN ST.
DOLLARD-DES-ORMEAUX
QUEBEC
CANADA
H9A3GA4

COPY MAILED

JUN 23 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Schwartz, et al. :
Application No. 08/418,286 : ON PETITION
Filed: 7 April, 1995 :
Attorney Docket No. (None) :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 16 June, 2004, to revive the above-identified application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

NOTE: Petitioner's submissions suggest a lack of familiarity with practice before the Office. Petitioner may wish to seek the guidance of an individual registered to practice before the Office, which information may be found at www.uspto.gov.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioners failed to reply timely and properly to the final Office action mailed on 27 February, 1996, with a reply due (absent a request and fee for extension of time) on or before Monday, 27 May, 1996;

- in late May 1996, the Office accepted Petitioners' Revocation of Power of Attorney from their former agent and Petitioners undertook prosecution *pro se*;
- following Petitioner's reply filed on 5 May, 1996, which reply did not place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner mailed an Advisory Action on 3 June, 1996;
- the application was deemed abandoned after midnight 27 May, 1996;
- Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 1 October, 1996;
- the original petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 and §1.137(a) alleged as the basis of their claim of unavoidable delay over the seven years and nearly seven months between the due date of their reply and the filing of the original petition (in March 2003, to withdraw the holding of abandonment) that Petitioners had to go to court to seek copies of their papers from their former agent (copies of their court documents were submitted);
- the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 was dismissed on 4 November, 2003, and the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) was dismissed on 20 February, 2004;
- at the time of the dismissal of the 25 March, 2004, petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), Petitioners had not submitted a proper reply to the final Office action of 27 February, 1996;¹
- the instant renewal of the petition includes a Notice of Appeal (with fee).

Petitioner has filed a petition with fee, reply, terminal disclaimer with fee (previously filed), and has made the statement of unintentional delay.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).²

¹ With the original petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) Petitioners submitted a terminal disclaimer (and fee) and a document, which, which was not a proper reply to the 27 February, 1996, Office action in that it was not a Notice of Appeal, a CPA or RCE, and it did not *prima facie* place the application in condition for allowance. (See: MPEP §711.03(c).)

² 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority.

The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.³ Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.⁴ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁵

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁶ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care. By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁷

Petitioners have filed a petition (with fee) and reply in the form of a Notice of Appeal (and fee), previously submitted a terminal disclaimer (with fee); made the statement of unintentional delay.

The terminal disclaimer filed 25 March, 2003, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(d) has been entered and made of record.⁸

Petitioners have satisfied the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

³ Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

⁴ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁵ See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁶ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

⁷ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

⁸ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(d)(1) state that a terminal disclaimer filed pursuant to this rule must dedicate to the public a terminal part of the term of any patent granted thereon equivalent to the lesser of: 1) the period of abandonment of the application; or 2) the period extending beyond twenty years from the date on which the application for the patent was filed in the United States, or, if the application contains a specific reference to an earlier filed application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121 or 365(c), from the date on which the earliest such application was filed. Effective 20 September, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 54674, 8 September, 2000).

CONCLUSION

Therefore, the instant petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) hereby is **granted**.

The instant application is forwarded to Technology Center 3400 to await the filing of the Appeal Brief and fee by Petitioners, pursuant to the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.192.⁹

-
- ⁹ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.192 provide:
- §1.192 Appellant's brief.**
- (a) Appellant must, within two months from the date of the notice of appeal under §1.191 or within the time allowed for reply to the action from which the appeal was taken, if such time is later, file a brief in triplicate. The brief must be accompanied by the fee set forth in § 1.17(c) and must set forth the authorities and arguments on which appellant will rely to maintain the appeal. Any arguments or authorities not included in the brief will be refused consideration by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, unless good cause is shown.
- (b) On failure to file the brief, accompanied by the requisite fee, within the time allowed, the appeal shall stand dismissed.
- (c) The brief shall contain the following items under appropriate headings and in the order indicated below unless the brief is filed by an applicant who is not represented by a registered practitioner:
- (1) *Real party in interest.* A statement identifying the real party in interest, if the party named in the caption of the brief is not the real party in interest.
- (2) *Related appeals and interferences.* A statement identifying by number and filing date all other appeals or interferences known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.
- (3) *Status of claims.* A statement of the status of all the claims, pending or cancelled, and identifying the claims appealed.
- (4) *Status of amendments.* A statement of the status of any amendment filed subsequent to final rejection.
- (5) *Summary of invention.* A concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.
- (6) *Issues.* A concise statement of the issues presented for review.
- (7) *Grouping of claims.* For each ground of rejection which appellant contests and which applies to a group of two or more claims, the Board shall select a single claim from the group and shall decide the appeal as to the ground of rejection on the basis of that claim alone unless a statement is included that the claims of the group do not stand or fall together and, in the argument under paragraph (c)(8) of this section, appellant explains why the claims of the group are believed to be separately patentable. Merely pointing out differences in what the claims cover is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable.
- (8) *Argument.* The contentions of appellant with respect to each of the issues presented for review in paragraph (c)(6) of this section, and the basis therefor, with citations of the authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on. Each issue should be treated under a separate heading.
- (i) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and how the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is complied with, including, as appropriate, how the specification and drawings, if any,
- (A) Describe the subject matter defined by each of the rejected claims.
- (B) Enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the subject matter defined by each of the rejected claims, and
- (C) Set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his or her invention.
- (ii) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and how the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- (iii) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and why the rejected claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102, including any specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied upon in the rejection.
- (iv) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and, if appropriate, the specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied on in the rejection, and shall explain how such limitations render the claimed subject matter unobvious over the prior art. If the rejection is based upon a combination of references, the argument shall explain why the references, taken as a whole, do not suggest the claimed subject matter, and shall include, as may be appropriate, an explanation of why features disclosed in one reference may not properly be combined with features disclosed in another reference. A general argument that all the limitations are not described in a single reference does not satisfy the requirements of this

Petitioners have two months from the mail date of this decision to file their Appeal Brief in triplicate and fee. Extensions of time are governed by the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.136.¹⁰

paragraph.

(v) For any rejection other than those referred to in paragraphs (c)(8)(i)to (iv)of this section, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and the specific limitations in the rejected claims, if appropriate, or other reasons, which cause the rejection to be in error.

(9) *Appendix.* An appendix containing a copy of the claims involved in the appeal.

(d) If a brief is filed which does not comply with all the requirements of paragraph (c)of this section, appellant will be notified of the reasons for noncompliance and provided with a period of one month within which to file an amended brief. If appellant does not file an amended brief during the one-month period, or files an amended brief which does not overcome all the reasons for non-compliance stated in the notification, the appeal will stand dismissed.

[36 FR 5850,Mar.30.1971;para.(a),47 FR 41278, Sept.17,1982,effective Oct.1,1982;para.(a),49 FR 556, Jan.4, 1984, effective Apr.1,1984; 53 FR 23734, June 23, 1988,effective Sept.12, 1988; para. (a), (c), and (d) revised, 58 FR 54504,Oct.22,1993,effective Jan.3,1994; paras.(a)-(c)revised,60 FR 14488,Mar 17,1995,effective Apr.21,1995;para.(a)revised,62 FR 53131,Oct.10, 1997,effective Dec.1,1997]

¹⁰ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.136 provide:

§1.136 Extensions of time.

(a)(1)If an applicant is required to reply within a nonstatutory or shortened statutory time period, applicant may extend the time period for reply up to the earlier of the expiration of any maximum period set by statute or five months after the time period set for reply,if a petition for an extension of time and the fee set in §1.17(a)are filed, unless:

(i)Applicant is notified otherwise in an Office action;

(ii)The reply is a reply brief submitted pursuant to § 1..193(b);

(iii)The reply is a request for an oral hearing submitted pursuant to § 1..194(b);

(iv)The reply is to a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences pursuant to §1.196,§1.197 or § 1..304;or

(v)The application is involved in an interference declared pursuant to § 1.611.

(2)The date on which the petition and the fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee.The expiration of the time period is determined by the amount of the fee paid.A reply must be filed prior to the expiration of the period of extension to avoid abandonment of the application (§1.135), but in no situation may an applicant reply later than the maximum time period set by statute, or be granted an extension of time under paragraph (b)of this section when the provisions of this paragraph are available. See §1.136(b)for extensions of time relating to proceedings pursuant to §§ 1.193((b),1.194,1.196 or 1.197;§ 1.304 for extensions of time to appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or to commence a civil action;§ 1.550(c)for extensions of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings,§ 1.956 for extensions of time in *inter partes* reexamination proceedings; and § 1.645 for extensions of time in interference proceedings.

(3)A written request may be submitted in an application that is an authorization to treat any con-current or future reply,requiring a petition for an extension of time under this paragraph for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. An authorization to charge all required fees, fees under §1.17.or all required extension of time fees will be treated as a constructive petition for an extension of time in any concurrent or future reply requiring a petition for an extension of time under this paragraph for its timely submission. Submission of the fee set forth in §1.17(a)will also be treated as a constructive petition for an extension of time in any concurrent reply requiring a petition for an extension of time under this paragraph for its timely submission.

(b)When a reply cannot be filed within the time period set for such reply and the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section are not available, the period for reply will be extended only for sufficient cause and for a reasonable time specified. Any request for an extension of time under this paragraph must be filed on or before the day on which such reply is due, but the mere filing of such a request will not affect any extension under this paragraph. In no situation can any extension carry the date on which reply is duebeyond the maximum time period set by statute. See §1.304 for extensions of time to appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or to commence a civil action;§ 1.645 for extensions of time in interference proceedings,§ 1.550(c)for extensions of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings; and §1.956 for extensions of time in *inter partes* reexamination proceedings.

(c)If an applicant is notified in a "Notice of Allowability " that an application is otherwise in condition for allowance,the following time periods are not extendable if set in the "Notice of Allowability " or in an Office action having a mail date on or after the mail date of the "Notice of Allowability ":

(1)The period for submitting an oath or declaration in compliance with § 1.63;

(2)The period for submitting formal drawings set under § 1.85((c);and

(3)The period for making a deposit set under § 1.809((c).

[47 FR 41277,Sept.17,1982,effective Oct.1,1982; 49 FR 555,Jan.4,1984,effective Apr.1,1984;49 FR 48416,Dec.12,1984,effective Feb.11,1985; 54 FR 29551,July 13,1989,effective Aug.20,1989;para.(a) revised,58 FR 54504,Oct.22,1993,effective Jan.3,1994; revised, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec.1, 1997;para.(c)added,65 FR 54604,Sept.8,2000,effective Nov.7,2000;paras.(a)(2)and (b)revised,65 FR 76756, Dec. 7, 2000, effective Feb.5,2001;para.(c)revised,66 FR 21090,Apri.27,2001,effective May 29,2001]

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions